AIR FORCE AUDIT AGENCY



BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE 2005 IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS



AUDIT REPORT

F2008-0009-FD1000 25 July 2008

INTRODUCTION

Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 initiated a series of base closures and realignments beginning in 2005 to reduce excess infrastructure. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations (SAF/IEI) developed a database, the BRAC Management Tool (BMT), to manage requirements and related cost estimate data. Air Force and Major Command (MAJCOM) BRAC Program Management Office (PMO) personnel developed requirements to implement 64 BRAC 2005 recommendations totaling more than \$3.7 billion.

OBJECTIVES

We performed this audit because of Congressional interest in BRAC and high costs required for implementation. Our objective was to determine whether Air Force personnel properly estimated, updated, and supported cost estimates for BRAC 2005 implementation requirements.

CONCLUSIONS

Air Force personnel did not always properly estimate, update, and support BRAC 2005 implementation requirements. This was a repeat finding identified at the MAJCOM level in previous BRAC-related reports of audit. Specifically, of the \$411.2 million in BRAC cost estimates reviewed, Air Force organizations did not:

- Properly estimate \$25.4 million in requirements (\$11.3 million in overstatements and \$14.1 million in understatements). (Tab A, page 1)
- Delete invalid requirements in BRAC management tool (BMT) totaling about \$3.1 million.
 (Tab A, page 2)
- Provide sufficient supporting documentation for \$81.3 million in valid requirements. (Tab A, page 2)

By eliminating the \$14.4 million of overstated and no longer valid requirements, the Air Force could use these funds for other valid BRAC requirements and achieve a potential monetary benefit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We made one recommendation to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment and Logistics (SAF/IE) to improve the BRAC cost estimating

Executive Summary

process and update estimates in BMT. During the audit, MAJCOM personnel corrected \$14.4 million of the discrepancies identified in this report. (Reference Tab A for the specific recommendations.)

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

Management comments addressed the audit results, recommendations and potential monetary benefits. Corrective actions taken are responsive to the issues in this

report.

ROBERT F. BURKS

Rhut 2 Buch

Associate Director

(Engineering and Environment Division)

TONY M. AMES

Deputy Assistant Auditor General (Support and Personnel Directorate)

Table of Contents

		Page
EXECU	UTIVE SUMMARY	i
TAB		
A	Requirements and Cost Estimates	1
APPEN	DIX	
I	Requirements and Cost Estimate Discrepancies	7
II	Unresolved Discrepancies	9
III	Audit Scope and Prior Audit Coverage	11
IV	Locations Audited/Reports Issued	15
V	Points of Contact	17
VI	Final Report Distribution	19



BACKGROUND

Each MAJCOM¹ impacted by BRAC recommendations designated a PMO to document site survey results and create requirements. BRAC PMO personnel consolidated cost estimates into a Program Estimate and entered the costs into BMT to obtain funding. *Instructions for Preparing BRAC Program Estimates*, January 2007, states the BMT input should include base name, project title, amount, and the supporting methodology used to prepare the estimate with sufficient explanatory remarks. SAF/IEI approves the actions needed to implement BRAC recommendations shown in BMT.

AUDIT RESULTS 1 – REQUIREMENTS AND COST ESTIMATES

Condition. Air Force personnel² did not always properly estimate, update, and support cost estimates for BRAC 2005 implementation requirements.³ Of the \$411.2 million in BRAC estimates reviewed, we identified \$25.4 million were improperly estimated, \$3.1 million were invalid, and \$81.3 million in valid requirements lacked support. (Appendix I).

- Estimating Discrepancies. MAJCOM personnel did not properly estimate 54 (38 percent) of 141 valid requirements amounting to \$25.4 million (\$11.3 million in overstatements and \$14.1 million in understatements). To illustrate:
 - An estimate to move Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA) personnel from leased space in the National Capitol Region to Lackland AFB was overstated by \$1.82 million because the AFRPA representative did not

¹ For the purpose of this report, all MAJCOMs, Direct Reporting Units, Field Operating Agencies (FOA), and Air Staff are hereafter collectively referred to as MAJCOMs. Air Force Special Operations Command, United States Air Forces Europe, and United States Air Force Academy were not impacted by BRAC 2005.

² We identified erroneous or unsupported requirements at eight of ten Air Force organizations reviewed: HQ Air Force District of Washington (AFDW) which included three Field Operating Agencies (FOA): Air Force Central Adjudication Facility (AFCAF), Air Force News Agency (AFNA) and Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI). Additional organizations reviewed included Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment (AFCEE), Air Force Material Command (AFMC), HQ Air Mobility Command (AMC), Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC), Air National Guard (ANG), Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations (SAF/IEI), and Pacific Air Forces (PACAF). No discrepancies were noted at Headquarters Air Force Installations, Logistics and Mission Support (AF/A4/7) and Air Education and Training Command (AETC).

³ This was a repeat finding at the MAJCOM level identified in eight related reports of audit. (See Appendix III-Audit Scope and Prior Audit Coverage).

- correctly identify the number of personnel eligible for Permanent Change of Station (PCS) reimbursement.
- Although AFCEE personnel initially documented temporary civilian position costs, the estimate was not adjusted in BMT when the number of temporary civilian positions increased. The additional personnel would increase the estimate by \$3.1 million.
- No Longer Valid Requirements. MAJCOM personnel did not delete 11 of 141 BMT requirements valued at about \$3.1 million when the estimates were no longer valid. To illustrate:
 - HQ AFDW BRAC analyst input cost estimates of \$321,000 for civilian PCS and severance pay associated with the AFCAF move from Bolling AFB to Fort Meade VA. However, management later decided not to offer employees these options, but did not delete these requirements. Additionally, the analyst did not delete an \$80,000 cost estimate for an unnecessary⁴ AFNA leased space restoration.
 - HQ AFMC BRAC PMO personnel did not remove \$300,000 in clean-up cost at Wright-Patterson AFB (WPAFB) associated with a cancelled mission move to China Lake CA.
 - HQ AMC BRAC PMO personnel did not remove two non-environmental program estimates and a non-appropriated fund (NAF) severance pay estimate totaling \$1.4 million for joint basing as directed by SAF/IEI in December 2005. In addition, PMO personnel did not adjust a Construction Oversight Fee estimate totaling \$335,000 after contract award. Finally, PMO personnel did not reduce a NAF severance pay estimate at Grand Forks AFB once management decided not to offer this option.
- <u>Unsupported Costs</u>. MAJCOM personnel could not provide supporting documentation for 13 of 141 requirements valued at \$81.3 million. These projects represented valid requirements,⁵ but personnel did not document the methodology used to estimate the costs. For example:
 - HQ ANG engineers estimated \$3 million for construction site preparation, furniture, and communications infrastructure at McConnell and Robins AFBs without documenting how the costs were determined.

⁴ The lease agreement did not require the restoration.

⁵ SAF/IEI approves valid requirements that directly support a BRAC recommendation.

- HQ AFOSI personnel did not have supporting documentation for the \$23.9 million in cost estimates to co-locate the military investigative agencies at Quantico VA. These costs included transportation, information technology, and other costs.
- HQ Air Force Personnel Center (AFPC) personnel provided an estimate for officer and enlisted military personnel moves to support a SAF/IEI requirement. However, HQ AFPC personnel did not document the methodology used to derive \$52 million estimate. The moves were BRAC-related operational and rotational moves for Fiscal Years 2007 through 2009.

Cause. This condition occurred for the following reasons:

- In some cases SAF/IEI PMO did not adequately administer prescribed procedures to review, recalculate, and document each estimate, and to approve the support and methodology of cost estimates before input into BMT.6
- SAF/IEI did not aggressively pursue coordination with other DoD BRAC PMO
 personnel to obtain Business Plans and supporting documentation for Air Force
 estimates prepared by other military components such as the AFOSI move to
 Quantico VA. Although SAF/IEI PMO and the HQ AFOSI BRAC analyst contacted the Marine Corps/Navy business manager concerning the estimate, they
 received no response or supporting documentation.

Impact. By eliminating the \$14.4 million of overstated and invalid requirements, the Air Force could use these funds for other valid BRAC requirements and achieve a potential monetary benefit. Further, without proper documentation, BRAC officials could not support and justify \$81.3 million in valid requirements.

Management Corrective Action. During the audit, the MAJCOM BRAC PMO personnel corrected \$14.4 million (\$8.4 million in overstatements, \$3.6 million in understatements and \$2.4 million in invalid requirements) of the identified discrepancies. Of the \$10.8 million potential monetary benefit corrected during audit, management officials corrected \$2.6 million, installation-level reports corrected

⁶ Instructions for Preparing BRAC Program Estimates, January 2007, requires the commands to document cost estimates in sufficient detail for a non-interested party unfamiliar with the area to be able to reconstruct each step of the cost derivation.

⁷ Five related local audit reports issued to MAJCOM BRAC PMOs cited a total PMB of \$9.6 million. This report addresses the remaining \$4.6 million. Additionally \$203,925 is excluded as was previously reported in *Air Force Materiel Command Base Realignment and Closure Requirements Planning, F2007-0001-FD1000*, 20 November 2006.

Requirements and Cost Estimates

\$8.0 million, and \$0.2 million was claimed previously in AFAA Report of Audit F2007-0001-FD1000. Further, installation-level reports recommended management officials correct an additional \$1.6 million of overstated and invalid requirements. We made recommendations addressing the remaining \$14.1 unresolved requirements (\$2.9 million overstated, \$0.7 invalid, and \$10.5 million understated).

Recommendation A.1. SAF/IE should:

- a. Require MAJCOM BRAC PMOs:
- (1) Develop and maintain supporting documentation as specified in SAF/IEI PMO guidance for the \$81.3 million in valid but unsupported cost estimates (Appendix I).
- (2) Reduce the remaining \$3.6 million of overstated estimating discrepancies (\$2,931,450) and invalid requirements (\$694,000) (Appendix II).
- (3) Correct the remaining \$10.5 million in unresolved understated estimating discrepancies (Appendix II).
- b. Emphasize the requirement for program managers to review validate, and approve the logic and methodology of all cost estimates before the requirement is approved in BMT.
- c. Coordinate with other DoD BRAC PMOs to obtain Business Plans and supporting documentation for all estimates related to Air Force requirements in BMT.

Management Comments. SAF/IEI concurred with the audit results, recommendations, and potential monetary benefits and stated:

- a.(1) "Concur. During the February 2008 semiannual MAJCOM Program Management Review, SAF/IEEI PMO briefed MAJCOM BRAC program management personnel on the need for proper documentation for all valid requirements (Appendix I) placed into BMT. (CLOSED).
- a.(2) "Concur. SAF/IEI PMO provided MAJCOM BRAC program management personnel with the Unresolved Discrepancies List (Appendix II) and instructed personnel to reduce the remaining \$3.6 million of overstated estimating discrepancies and invalid requirements in BMT. (CLOSED).
- a.(3) "Concur. SAF/IEI PMO instructed MAJCOM BRAC program management personnel to correct the remaining identified discrepancies as needed. (CLOSED).

- b. "Concur. In June 2008, SAF/IEI PMO emphasized to MAJCOM BRAC management personnel to review, validate, and approve the logic and methodology of all costs estimates before submitting requirements for approval in BMT. (CLOSED).
- c. "Concur. SAF/IEI PMO coordinated with other DoD BRAC PMOs in January 2008 to obtain Business Plans and supporting documentation for all cost estimates related to Air Force requirements in BMT. (CLOSED)."

Evaluation of Management Comments. Management comments addressed the audit results, recommendations and potential monetary benefits. Corrective actions taken are responsive to the issues in this report.

Requirements and Cost Estimate Discrepancies

Locations	Overstated Estimates	Understated Estimates	Invalid Amounts	Unsupported Estimates
AFDW				
AFCAF-Bolling AFB	\$ 62,000			
AFCEE-Multiple		\$ 3,153,747		
AFNA-Lackland AFB	178,000*	1,285,000		
AFOSI-Andrews AFB				\$ 6,291,000*
AFOSI-Quantico				17,600,000
AFRPA-Lackland AFB	1,820,000			
Andrews AFB				402,000
Bolling AFB	91,000		\$ 534,000*	455,000
Lackland AFB			80,000	
AFDW Total	2,151,000	4,438,747	614,000	24,748,000
HQ AFMC				
Brooks City Base		1,454,927		
Eglin AFB	420,000	1,400,000		
Hanscom AFB		1,425,439*		
Tinker AFB	203,925	23,303		
Wright-Patterson AFB	1,675,100*		300,000	
HQ AFMC Total	2,299,025	4,303,669	300,000	
HQ AFRC				
General Mitchell International				
Airport (IA)			535,000	
HQ AFRC Total			535,000	
HQ AMC				
Grand Forks AFB			159,000	
Little Rock AFB	1,408,000*			
MacDill AFB	112,000*	205,000*	56,000	
McChord AFB			1,435,000*	
Pope AFB	109,059	878,242		
Scott AFB	748,000*			
HQ AMC Total	2,377,059	1,083,242	1,650,000	
HQ ANG				
Dane County Regional Airport				
Air Guard Station (AGS)		473,223		
Elmendorf AFB		166,503*		1,500,000
Fairchild AFB	1,482			
Fort Wayne IA AGS		465,335		
Forbes Field AGS		149		
Fresno Air Terminal AGS		719,974		
Great Falls IA AGS		11,126		
Joe Foss Field AGS		485,575		
Lambert-St Louis IA AGS	113,936*			
McEntire AGS	*	734,285*		
McConnell AFB	328,057*	,		1,050,000*
McGee Tyson Airport	- 7	94,412		,,.
New Orleans Naval Air Station		1,033,669		
Niagara Falls IA AGS		55,516		
Robins AFB	46,975			2,025,000*
HQ ANG Total	490,450	4,239,767		4,575,000
HQ PACAF	.,	, , ,		, , , , , ,
Eielson AFB		12,000		
Elmendorf AFB	3,966,000	5,000		
Galena Forwarding Operating	2,200,000	5,000		
Location Containing Operating	9,000			
HQ PACAF	3,975,000	17,000		
SAF/IEI- Multiple locations	-,,000	=7,000		52,025,000*
Total Errors	\$11,292,534	\$14,082,424	\$3,099,000	\$81,348,000
10441211013	Ψ11,2/2,33 4	Ψ17,002,727	ψ5,077,000	φοτ,540,000

Organization	Requirements	Overstated Estimates	Understate Estimates	Invalid Amount
AFCEE	Temporary Civilian Positions		\$ 3,153,747	
AFDW	Civilian Severance Pay	\$ 91,000		
AFDW/AFCAF	Fort Meade Transportation	62,000		
AFDW/AFNA	Fort Meade Transportation	86,000		
HQ AFMC	Archeological Site Protection		1,400,000	
	Global Air Traffic Operations			
HQ AFMC	furniture		23,303	
	Transition Costs for AFRL			
HQ AFMC	Directed Energy		1,454,927	
	Transition at Hanscom to WP			
HQ AFMC	AFB		260,551	
HQ AMC	Communication Upgrades Bldg 6	46,000*		
	Communication Infrastructure			
HQ AMC	Bldg 55	46,000*		
HQ AMC	AMC HQ Wing Bldg	1,400,000		
***	Program Management Support			
HQ AMC	(Civil Engineering)	710,000*		
****	Severance Pay for NAF			↑ 1 1 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
HQ AMC	Employees		121011	\$159,000*
HQ ANG	Vehicle Maintenance Shop		134,941	
	Relocate 202 Engineering			
****	Installation Squadron (EIS)	45055		
HQ ANG	Operations	46,975	452.222	
HQ ANG	Furniture		473,223	
HQ ANG	Equipment Move		149	
HQ ANG	Furniture		465,335	
HQ ANG	Furniture		719,974	
HQ ANG	Digitized Aircraft Maintenance		11,126	
HQ ANG	Furniture		485,575	
HQ ANG	Equipment Move	26,216		
HQ ANG	Construct Mini Igloos	281,556		
HQ ANG	Install Walls, Four Igloos	46,501		
HQ ANG	Furniture		733,302	
HQ ANG	Furniture		94,412	
HQ ANG	Furniture		1,033,669	
	Relocate 157 Air Operations			
****	Group 218 EIS Drill Status	0 5 50 04		
HQ ANG	Guardsman	87,720*		
HQ ANG	Equipment Move	1,482		
HO ANG	Communication Infrastructure -		222	
HQ ANG	Equipment		983	
HQ ANG	Special Workdays		55,516	
HO AFR	General Mitchell International			505 000°
HQ AFRC	Airport		12.000	535,000*
HQ PACAF	A-10 HQ Travel		12,000	
HQ PACAF	F-15C/D HQ Travel	ΦΩ 021 450	5,000	0.004.000
Totals	ommended in installation-level repo	\$2,931,450	\$10,517,733	\$694,000

AUDIT SCOPE

Audit Coverage. We performed this audit at six MAJCOMs, a Direct Reporting Unit,⁸ a FOA,⁹ and Air Staff¹⁰ (Appendix IV). We accomplished audit fieldwork from May 2007 through November 2007 using documentation dated from September 1996 through November 2007. We issued management a draft report in April 2008.

To determine whether costs were properly estimated, updated and supported, we:

- Obtained supporting documentation from MAJCOM personnel.
- Validated computations and methodologies used to establish the cost estimates.
- Discussed cost estimates with MAJCOM personnel.
- Compared validated cost estimates to BMT entries as of 14 August 2007 to determine consistency.

Sampling Methodology. We used the following sampling and Computer Assisted Auditing Tools and Techniques (CAATTs) to accomplish our objective.

- <u>Sampling</u>. We judgmentally selected requirements from the unresolved discrepancies tables located in Appendix I of the BRAC Requirements Planning audits below.¹¹ We compared the requirement amounts displayed in those reports to the amounts in BMT as of 14 August 2007. We then based our judgmental selection on those items with no change.
- <u>CAATTs</u>. We used CAATTs to analyze data. Specifically, using Excel Spreadsheets:
 - We downloaded requirements from BMT and used: (a) filter functions and sort commands to analyze and track cost estimates and requirements; and (b) mathematic functions to develop magnitude and value of requirements.

⁸ Air Force District of Washington is responsible for managing selected FOA BRAC requirements.

⁹ Air Force Center for Engineering and Environment is a FOA not managed by the Air Force District of Washington.

¹⁰ HQ Air Force Installations, Logistics and Mission Support (AF/A4/7) and Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations (SAF/IEI).

¹¹ The Related Reports paragraph below lists all prior audit reports used to select our sample.

 We used general functions such as COUNTIF and SUM to interpret and summarize results. We applied IF Statements and Conditional Formatting to return quick results and to notate errors in large amounts of data.

Data Reliability. We extensively relied on computer-generated data contained in BMT to accomplish this audit. We did not evaluate the systems' general and application controls. Instead, we established the data's reliability by comparing cost estimates with available manual records for obvious errors, reasonableness, and completeness; and recalculated totals to verify math operations. Based on these tests, we concluded the data was sufficiently reliable to support audit conclusions.

Auditing Standards. We accomplished audit work in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards and accordingly, tests of management controls related to data controls related to BRAC requirement development. The specific controls evaluated included management documentation reviews and oversight and the maintenance, accuracy, and sufficiency of supporting documentation.

PRIOR AUDIT COVERAGE

Although we did not identify any DoD Inspector General, or Government Accountability Office reports issued within the past 5 years that addressed the same or similar objectives as this audit, we did identify eight related Air Force Audit Agency reports. The related reports did include recommendations requiring follow up.

RELATED REPORTS

All eight of the following reports concluded initial requirements and cost estimates were not always accurate and properly supported. Management's actions to correct the reported conditions were only partially effective. A repeat finding is documented in this report.

- Air Force Audit Agency Report of Audit F2006-0006-FD1000, Air Force Reserve Command Base Realignment and Closure Requirements Planning, 3 August 2006.
- Air Force Audit Agency Report of Audit F2006-0007-FD1000, *Pacific Air Forces Base Realignment and Closure Requirements Planning*, 23 August 2006.
- Air Force Audit Agency Report of Audit F2006-0008-FD1000, Air Education and Training Base Realignment and Closure Requirements Planning, 23 August 2006.

- Air Force Audit Agency Report of Audit F2006-0009-FD1000, *Air Combat Command Base Realignment and Closure Requirements Planning*, 23 August 2006.
- Air Force Audit Agency Report of Audit F2006-0010-FD1000, *Air National Guard Base Realignment and Closure Requirements Planning*, 23 August 2006.
- Air Force Audit Agency Report of Audit F2007-0001-FD1000, *Air Force Materiel Command Base Realignment and Closure Requirements Planning*, 20 November 2006.
- Air Force Audit Agency Report of Audit F2007-0002-FD1000, Air Force Space Command Base Realignment and Closure Requirements Planning, 20 November 2006.
- Air Force Audit Agency Report of Audit F2007-0006-FD1000, Air Mobility Command and Air Force of Washington Base Realignment and Clsoure Requirements Planning, 19 January 2007.

Locations Audited/ Reports Issued

Installation-Level

Organization/Location Reports Issued

United States Air Force (USAF)

HQ USAF/A4/7 NONE

Washington DC

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations

NONE

Washington DC

<u>Air Education and Training Command (AETC)</u>

HQ AETC NONE

Randolph AFB TX

<u>Air Force District of Washington (AFDW)</u>

HQ AFDW NONE

Bolling AFB DC

<u>Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC)</u>

HQ AFMC F2008-0015-FCW000 Wright-Patterson AFB OH 18 March 2008

<u>Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC)</u>

HQ AFRC
Robins AFB GA
F2008-0016-FCR000
7 February 2008

Air Mobility Command (AMC)

HQ AMC F2008-0043-FBL000 Scott AFB IL 19 March 2008

Air National Guard (ANG)

HQ ANG
Andrews AFB MD
F2008-0016-FDN000
3 March 2008

Locations Audited/ Reports Issued

Installation-Level Reports Issued

Organization/Location

Pacific Air Force (PACAF)

HQ PACAF
Hickam AFB HI
F2008-0018-FBP000
8 April 2008

Field Operating Agencies

Air Force Center for Engineering and Environment NONE

Brooks City-Base TX

Engineering and Environment Division (AFAA/SPE) Support and Personnel Audits Directorate 2509 Kennedy Circle Brooks City-Base TX 78235-5116

Robert F. Burks, Associate Director DSN 240-8035 Commercial (210) 536-8035

Davina Lock, Program Manager

Euthena Sensley, Audit Manager

We accomplished this audit under project number F2007-FD1000-0077.000.

Final Report Distribution

SAF/IE SAF/OS SAF/US SAF/FM SAF/IG SAF/PA SAF/XC, AF/A6 AF/CC AF/CV

AF/CVA AF/A4/7 AF/RE NGB/CF GAO

AU Library DoD Comptroller OMB ACC AFISR AETC AFDW AFMC AFOSI AFSPC AMC PACAF

Units/Orgs Audited

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

The disclosure/denial authority prescribed in AFPD 65-3 will make all decisions relative to the release of this report to the public.

To request copies of this report or to suggest audit topics for future audits, contact the Operations Directorate at (703) 696-7913 (DSN 426-7913) or E-mail to reports@pentagon.af.mil. Certain government users may download copies of audit reports from our home page at www.afaa.hq.af.mil/. Finally, you may mail requests to:

Air Force Audit Agency Operations Directorate 1126 Air Force Pentagon Washington DC 20330-1126